

26

KÊNÔPANISHAD

WITH THE COMMENTARY

OF

Sri Sankaracharya



Translated into English

BY

M. HIRIYANNA, M. A.

Digitized by eGangotri
KÊNÔPANISHAD

WITH THE COMMENTARY

OF

SRÎ SANKARÂCHÂRYA

Translated into English

BY

M. HIRIYANNA, M.A.



SRIRANGAM:

SRI VANI VILAS PRESS,

1912.

Copyright Registered.



NOTE.

THE two manuscripts referred to in the Note to the '*Īśāvāsyaopanishad*' have been consulted in this translation also and the few variations in readings suggested are based on them. Many of the foot-notes are taken from the *Tikā* usually printed with the text of the *Bhāshya*. This *Tikā*, however, does not appear to be by *Ānandagiri* for more than one manuscript ascribes it to a different author.

MYSORE, }
6th October 1912. }

M. H.

INTRODUCTION.

The *Kēnōpanishad* forms a part of the *Jaimintya* or *Talavakāra Brāhmaṇa* of the *Sāma Vēda*, and is, for that reason, also known as the *Talavakārōpanishad*. Its four *khandas* or sections divide themselves into two parts—the first part comprising sections i and ii which are in a metrical form, and the second, comprising sections iii and iv, which are in simple, stately prose. This difference in the outer form of the two parts corresponds with a difference in their subject-matter as well. The first part deals with the unqualified (*nirguṇa*) Brahman or the absolute principle underlying the world of appearances, while the second, treats of the qualified (*saguṇa*) Brahman or the *Īṣvara* of popular belief. Thus the present *Upanishad*, in its brief compass, takes into account both the phases of *Vedāntic* teaching and inculcates not merely the higher but also what is termed the 'lower knowledge' of Brahman. The first of these two kinds of knowledge is intended for persons who, seeing the unsubstantiality of the things of sense, withdraw their thoughts from the interests of everyday life and desire to realise the ultimate fact of the universe. The second

kind of knowledge is meant for those who although deeply pious yet perceive but dimly the distinction between the transient and the eternal and are consequently unable to detach themselves from the ordinary work-a-day world. As may be expected there is also a well-marked distinction between the results which these two kinds of knowledge are calculated to produce. The higher knowledge of Brahman (*parā vidyā*) procures immediate liberation (*sadyōmukti*), when the individual Self, 'fusing all its skirts' reemerges in the Universal Being. The lower knowledge of Brahman (*aparā vidyā*), on the other hand, puts one in the right path that leads to deliverance eventually (*kramāmukti*). For a long time, in this case, does the Self continue to exist individualised; but, at last, it acquires higher knowledge, and through that knowledge regains its identity with the Supreme.

The following is a summary of the teaching contained in the two parts—

- (i) The first section opens with a question put to a teacher by a disciple who is convinced of the utter futility of relying on the passing things of experience and yearns after a permanent reality by devotion to which he may attain abiding peace. He accordingly desires to know

whether such a permanent reality is implied in the manifold activities of the senses and the mind or whether these activities are, after all, wholly dependent upon the transient physical organism with which they are associated. The teacher denies the possibility of the physical organism—a mere 'thing of matter'—being an automaton and states that for the source of the functions of the various senses and the mind we must look elsewhere. This permanent source of their power is here termed Brahman which however, the teacher adds, cannot be expressed directly (*vāchayatayā*) for it possesses no specific attributes by which it can be described (in words or figured in thought.) Brahman is, in other words, absolute and reason as well as sense-perception fail to compass it. It can however be referred to indirectly (*lakshyatayā*) through adjuncts which, empirically speaking, constitute its limitations—*śrōtrasya śrōtram* 'manasō manah' and so on, which means that Brahman is the inmost essence—

the basal fact—of the various sensory perceptions and intellectual operations. The precise bearing of this indirect answer is hard to understand and the statement that Brahman lies beyond the reach of reason as well as sense-perception appears to throw doubt upon the very existence of the alleged reality. Therefore the teacher, relying on authentic tradition, proceeds to give a separate 'definition' of Brahman which by its negative import suggests that the permanent reality underlying the phenomenal universe and the individual Self are ultimately but one. This step in the course of teaching suddenly transforms into a positive reality what was hitherto an extraneous and unascertainable something hardly distinguishable from non-entity. Our consciousness of Brahman may continue to be *indefinite* but there can be no doubt that it has now become *positive* for, if Brahman be ultimately one with our own Self, we are under an intuitive obligation to recognise it, our Self being the one reality from which we cannot

get away. This fundamental identity of Brahman with the empirical Self forms the central teaching of the *Vedānta* and the fact that it is based on an ancient text indicates the immemorial character of that teaching. The closing verses of the section re-affirm, in resounding notes, this ancient truth—that god in the sense of a personality exterior to us does not exist.

Since Brahman is eventually the same as the individual Self, we may get an *immediate* apprehension of Brahman, but it can never be an *object* of knowledge. The absolute must ever remain unknowable and a Brahman *known* would be no Brahman at all. To remove possible misconceptions in this respect, the teacher, in the next section, elicits the real significance of the previous section from the disciple who has by a proper course of previous self-discipline fitted himself for receiving the highest truth, and has therefore grasped the full import of the teaching and has by due reflection and contemplation realised Brah-

man in himself. Though the second section is thus merely recapitulatory in character, it is important as containing a statement (stanza 4) which shows how Brahman is continually present to our mind and can therefore be recognised at every stage of the unending stream of our ordinary consciousness. Consciousness involves self-consciousness, and, the Self being in reality identical with Brahman, every mode or sample of consciousness when divested of its 'phenomenal ingredient' gives us a glimpse of the ever persistent Reality which is 'without beginning or end, eternal, pure in form, devoid of distinction and the same in all.' It is, in fact, the sole unit of being. This monistic solution signifying that the material world and all the relations of life are mere figments (*kalpana*) indicates that the way to abiding peace lies in getting beyond them and realising the Self or Brahman. *Bhūteshu bhūteshu vichitya dhīrāḥ prētya asmāllōkāt amṛitā bhavanti.*

(ii) In part ii the ground shifts from abstract philosophy to religion. Having indicated how Brahman can be cognised, the *Upanishad* now points out how it may be symbolised. By means of a well-chosen episode in which the highest deities figure, we are shown how the great *Īṣvara*, who has created the Universe, keeps a jealous watch over it and how the power that expresses itself through even the highest gods is but the reflex of the power of that *Īṣvara*. This episode is followed by the statement of a method of meditating upon *Īṣvara* or Brahman personified—as a preparation for that higher knowledge which alone can procure immediate release from the cycle of *ex-istence*. Meditation is but a means of mental discipline—a method of controlling the ever-shifting activity of the mind which has been so aptly described as ‘a kaliedoscope of thoughts in constant motion.’ By holding out certain proximate benefits as the reward of concentrating all one’s thoughts on a single word or object—usually a

symbol of the Most High—precepts relating to meditation help the gradual cultivation of that 'intensity of thought and serenity of temper,' which are necessary for suppressing the myriad shows of sense and perceiving the reality veiled by them.

It now remains only to refer to passage 8 of section iv which, though appearing in that section, does not really form a part of it. This passage, as shown in the commentary on iv, 7, occupies the position of an appendix to the whole *Upanishad* and mentions certain moral and intellectual qualities as the indispensable conditions of success in reaching the *Védāntic* goal. These qualities are practically the same as what are termed the *sādhana-chatushtayam* in systematic treatises on the *Védānta*. The great importance that is attached to this preliminary discipline is well-indicated by the legend of *Indra* and *Virōchana* to which reference is made more than once in the commentary, and it is necessary to lay special stress on such discipline for, without it, *Brahma-jignāsa* degenerates into a mere theoretic curiosity which, according to the plan of the *Védānta*, cannot bring about the desired deliverance.

KÉNÓPANISHAD

WITH THE COMMENTARY

OF

SRÎ SANKARÂCHÂRYA.

The ninth chapter (of the *Talavakâra Brâhmaṇa*) is begun in order to communicate the *Upanishad* treating of the supreme Brahman and opening with (the words) *kēna ishitaṃ*. Prior to this, (the treatment of) all *karma* has been completed and likewise have been explained the meditations on *Prâṇa*¹—the basis of all *karma*—as also those on *sâmans* subsidiary to *karma*. Immediately after, has also been indicated the contemplation of the *Gâyatrâsâman*, followed by a genealogical list² (of the teachers of the *Sâma Vêda*)³. All this—*karma*

1. *Prâṇa* is the first-born principle of the Universe. Brahman, viewed as the source of creation, is termed *Iṣvara*. From *Iṣvara* is born *Prâṇa* or *Sâtrâtman* which is the universe itself but with its various elements only in their subtle or undeveloped form. *Prâṇa*, in its turn, gives rise to *Virât* or the Universe as we perceive it.

2. *Sishyâchâryasantânâvichchêdo vamṣaḥ—Tikâ.*

3. I put a full stop after *vamṣântam uktam* and omit *kâryam*.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri

and *upāsana*¹, heretofore explained,—when duly practised by one seeking liberation, with no selfish desire for rewards, tends to purity of mind. For one, however, that is desirous of rewards and is (thus) ignorant (of the real nature) of the Self,² *karma*—as laid down in the *Srutis* and *Smṛtis*—dissociated (from meditation)—obtains the 'southern path' leading to renewed birth. From yielding to natural *unśāstraic* impulses, there results a falling down—from brute creation to plant life. Compare *Ch. Up.* (v. x. 8),—"Whoever do not follow either of these paths, continually return (to life) as petty beings and (of them it may be said), 'Be born and die.' This is the third place." There is also (in this matter) the following (authority of the) *Samhitā* (as distinguished from the *Brāhmaṇa* in which occurs the passage just quoted)—'Three kinds of beings go by a farther course'³. In a person of purified mind, on the other hand,—with no selfish

1. It should be noted that *jñāna* here means *upāsana* and not the knowledge of Brahman, which, as will hereafter be shown, cannot be combined with *karma*.

2. I read *ātmajñānarahitasya* in place of *jñānarahitasya*.

3. The first eight *adhyāyas* of the *Talavakāra Brāhmaṇa*, as has been indicated in the commentary, deal with *karma* and *upāsana*. He who practises these two together, with a view to obtain their fruit, qualifies himself for what is known as the 'northern path' from which there is no return to this world. Individualised existence, how-

desires whatever,—who grows indifferent to the extraneous and transient correlation of end and means, there springs, through a distinctive culture arising from his deeds in this or former life, a desire to know the inner Self.¹ This point is indicated by the present *śruti* which is in the form of a dialogue beginning with *kēna ishitaṃ*. The same has also been stated in *Kaṭha Up*: (iv, 1). —‘The self-existent ruined the senses by turning them outwards; therefore (it is that man) looks outwards and not into himself. (Rarely, however,) some wise man turning his eyes inwards² and desir-

ever, continues in his case, long after death, but in a higher form, and eventually leads to *kramamukti* or slow advance towards complete liberation. If instead of thus practising both together, one performs *karma* alone without *upāsana*, the result will be a march on the ‘southern path’ which sooner or later leads to renewed existence on this earth. A third course is still open and that is to follow one’s natural impulses without heeding what is prescribed or prohibited by the *Śrutis* and *Smṛtis*. The result of such living, will be a degradation—extending over practically infinite time—from man’s rank to that of lower beings. Of these three courses, the first is not explicitly mentioned in the commentary but is implied.

1. *Vairāgya* is a necessary preliminary to a fruitful investigation of Brahman. The desire to know Brahman, when found alongside of worldly attachment, is a mere curiosity, and will not lead to salvation.—*Tikā*.

2. Here the expression, ‘turning his eyes inwards’ implies withdrawal from the world.

ing for immortality, sees the deeper Self.' So also in *Mund: Up:* (i. ii, 12) — 'Having examined all the worlds attained by *karma*, a *Brāhmaṇa* should give up desires; for the eternal is not to be got through the ephemeral; and in order to know *that* (the eternal) he should, as a rule, approach, with fuel in hand, a teacher learned in the *Vedas* and devoted to Brahman'. When thus grown indifferent (to wordly affairs) does one become able to know¹ the internal Self as also to study, cogitate and contemplate upon it; and not otherwise. And through such knowledge of the (identity of the) individual Self and Brahman, vanishes entirely nescience, the source of metempsychosis—the cause of desire and activity. Compare—'What delusion then, and what sorrow to one who discovers unity (*Īṣa Up:* 7); 'A knower of the Self overcomes grief' (*Ch: Up:* vii i 3); 'The heart's knots become untied; all doubts are solved; and all one's *karma* ends when one beholds that which is both cause and effect. (*Mund: Up:* ii. ii. 8).

If it be urged that the self-same result (*i. e.*, the removal of nescience) follows from knowledge combined with *karma*, (we reply,) 'No', for in the *Brhadāranyakōpanishad* such (combination) is said to produce a different result altogether. Thus (in the

1. *I. e.*, merely to apprehend the Self *intellectually* and not to *realise* it. Self-realisation follows *śravaṇa* &c., and does not precede them.

section) beginning with 'Let me have a wife' (i. iv. 17) the statement that 'Through' a son is attained this world, not by any *karma*; through *karma* the world of the manes; through knowledge, the world of the gods' (i. v. 16)—indicates the cause of the three-fold world *other than the Self*. The same Upanishad, again, while enjoining renunciation, assigns the following reason—'What have we to do with offspring—we to whom the Self is the only desired end?' (iv. iv. 22). The significance¹, of this reason is—'What have we to do with offspring, *karma* or knowledge combined with it, which (respectively) lead to the worlds of mortals, manes and gods and are not the means of attaining the world of the Self?' This three-fold world which is transient and attainable by (worldly) means is not what we seek; we desire that (end) which is inherent, unborn, undecaying, immortal, fearless—which neither increases nor decreases by *karma*. Being eternal, there is no possibility of its being attained by means other than the removal of nescience. Hence it means through a knowledge² of the (identity of the) individual and

1. The passage just quoted contains only the word *prajā* and the commentator explains it as implying also the other two means referred to, above—viz, *karma* and *vidyā* or 'lower knowledge' relating to deities.

2. See note 1, p. 2. *Vignāna*, here also, means a mere intellectual apprehension of the Self. If it meant 'Self-realisation' there would be no need to prescribe renunciation of *karma*, for in that final stage, *sannyāsa* is a necessity

the Supreme Self, all desires have necessarily to be renounced. Further (such combination) is impossible since the knowledge that the individual Self is identical with the Supreme and *karma* are mutually exclusive. For co-existence of *karma* which recognises the distinctions of 'doer' and 'done' with knowledge relating to the identity of the individual Self with the Supreme, which negatives all such distinctions is certainly inconceivable. The knowledge of Brahman, depending as it does on an existing entity, cannot be contingent¹ upon what a person does or does not. Thus the *Upanishad* beginning with *kēna ishitaṃ* (which follows the sections on *karma* and

(*svataḥ prāptaḥ*) and does not need to be prescribed. Renunciation is enjoined on one that has only a *mediate* perception or *parōkshajñāna* of the Self and endeavours after obtaining an *immediate* perception or *aparōkshajñāna* of it. *Brahmajñānasya anubhāvāvasānatāsiddhaye parōkshanischayapūrvakaḥ sannyāsaḥ kartavyaḥ*.—*Tikā*.

1. This is said in answer to a possible objection that from the view-point of knowledge, variety cannot be altogether denied, as has been done in the previous statement, because the *Sruti* makes knowledge, just as it does *karma* also, the subject of an injunction (as e. g., in *ātma vā arē drashtavyaḥ*) and thereby implies variety, in the one case as in the other. The *advaitin* does not admit that knowledge can at all be enjoined for injunctions always have reference to that which can be accomplished through effort. *Jñāna*, for its manifestation, depends upon what is already accomplished and does not therefore need any effort. In sense-perception, for instance, the contact of the organ of

upāsana) is for imparting the knowledge of the (identity of the) individual Self with the Supreme to one that has grown indifferent to the ends, attained by extraneous means,—whether those ends be visible (*i. e.*, attainable in this life) or invisible (*i. e.*, attainable in a future life). The statement in the form of a dialogue between a teacher and his disciple is, considering the subtle nature of the subject-matter, for making it easy of comprehension. It further suggests that this theme should not be investigated with the aid of (one's own) reason. Compare—'This knowledge is not to be attained through reason' (*Kāth: Up: i. ii. 9*). There are various other statements also (showing the necessity of a teacher) both in the *Srutis* and the *Smṛtis* such as—'He who has a teacher knows' (*Ch: Up: vi. xiv. 2*); 'Learnt only from a teacher will this knowledge yield the best (fruit)' (*Id. iv. ix. 3*); 'Know that by prostration etc. (*Bh. Gī. iv. 34*).

We should (here) imagine that some one finding no refuge, besides the inner Self, and seeking what is fearless, eternal, propitious and unchangeable, duly approached a teacher, devoted to Brahman, and questioned him as follows.—

sense with its object is sufficient to produce the impression and, given such contact, the impression is a necessary result. Similarly in the case of Brahma-knowledge, which also relates to an existing entity.

1. Sent forth by whose wish does the mind reach (its object)? By whom commanded does the chief *prāna* move? At whose desire do (people) utter this speech? And what power is it that prompts the eye and the ear?

Kēna=by what agent? *ishitam*=*ishtam*=desired. *manah*=(mind). *patati* i. e., goes forth towards its object. Of the meanings of (the root) *ish*, 'frequency' and 'motion' being inapplicable here, the form—*ishitam*—in the text is to be understood as derived from (the same root with its third) meaning of 'desire'. The intermediate augment,—*it*—is an instance of vedic license.¹ *prêshitam* is also from the same (root) with the prefix *pra* added on, and means 'being commanded'. If only *prêshitam* were used here (and not *ishitam* also) there would arise questions about the nature of the sender and of sending, as—'By what sort of sender? What is the mode of sending?' If, on the other hand, *ishitam* also is used, both these (questions) disappear and it then specifically means—'Sent forth

1. The grammatically correct form is *ishita* and not *ishita* when the word is derived from '*ish*'—to desire. Hence this observation.

by whose mere wish?'¹ (Here, however, an opponent may say)—'If this were the meaning intended to be conveyed, the object would be gained by using *ishitam* alone and there would be no need for adding *prêshitam* as well. Further, it is but right to conclude that the use of an *extra* word signifies an *extra* idea and interpret the text as meaning—'Sent forth by whom—through desire or act or speech?' (We reply that), from the tenor of the questions (put by the disciple), this view cannot (be taken as right). This tenor makes it clear that the question is asked by one that feels a dislike for the aggregate of causes and effects—such as the body which is transient and caused,—and is desirous of knowing something which is different from it and is always constant and eternal. The question would otherwise be not significant at all because according to the current belief it is the aggregates such as the body, that impel by means of desire, speech and act. Even thus (the opponent may rejoin) the force of *prêshitam* has not been properly brought out. We reply—"Not so. This question is asked by one that is in doubt, which (circumstance) renders it clear that the word

1. By the word 'wish' should here be understood the mere *presence* of the Self, for it would be incorrect to attribute any 'wishing,' in the ordinary sense, to the Self. *Ichchâ mâtरेण prayatnamantarêण sannidhimâtरेण—Tikâ.* The usual example given for illustrating influence from proximate presence is a magnet attracting a piece of iron.

prêshitam has a special significance here. It means—'Does direction proceed, as ordinarily believed, from the aggregate of causes and effects—like the body? or, Are mind and the like prompted by the mere presence of an independent principle distinct from that aggregate?' In order to indicate thus much both the modifying terms—*ishitam* and *prêshitam*—have to be used." Well, is it not (usually) admitted that the mind, being independent, reaches its objects of its own accord? In that case where is the relevance of the (disciple's) question? To this point we reply (as follows)—If mind were thus free to reach or avoid its objects, no one would think of harmful things. But (we know for a fact that) knowing a thing as bad, the mind desires it and, though checked, it sets about business which is imminent with misery. Hence it is appropriate to ask—'By whose wish &c.' *Kêna*=(by whom?). *prâṇah*=(breath). *yuktah*=commanded or induced. *praiti* i. e., sets about its business. The epithet *prathamah* is to be taken with *prâṇah*, its activity being prior to that of all the senses¹. *Kêna*=(by whom?). *ishitam*=(desired). *imâm vâcham*=this speech i.e., articulate sounds. *vadanti* i. e., people utter. Similarly, the fourth *pâda* means 'Which power is it that directs or induces the eye and the ear to reach their respective objects?'

15. See *Prasna Upanishad* ii.

The Teacher replies to his worthy disciple who has thus questioned him (as follows)—‘Hear what you want—viz. what power directs the several senses such as the mind towards their respective objects and how it directs’.—

2. Because it is the ear of ear, the mind of mind, the speech also of speech, the breath of breath, and the eye of eye, wise men giving up (the ordinary wrong notions) and departing from this world, become immortal.

Srôtra is that by which one hears i. e., the means of hearing sound,—the organ of hearing which reveals sound. *srôtrasya* = of such ear. *srôtram* = ear. It means—that which you ask is ‘the ear of ear’. The reply (it may be thought) should properly have been in the form ‘So and so, of such and such description, directs the ear etc.’ Is it not therefore inappropriate to state in reply (to the disciple’s question)—‘It is the ear of ear &c.’? (We say that) there is no such impropriety for nobody knows how that (power) can otherwise be characterised. If the prompter of the ear &c., were known to possess a function of

its own, apart from that of the ear and so forth, as in the case of a person that uses a scythe, for instance, then this would be an inappropriate reply. But no such entity prompting the ear and the like is known through a distinctive function of its own, as in the case of a mower. It is, on the other hand (only indirectly) known from the activity, such as seeing, desiring and deciding, of the aggregates like the ear, intended to bring about a result, thus—There should be something distinct from the ear and the like for whose sake operates this group of the ear and the rest, as in the case of a house (which is built for a dweller). The existence of something influencing the ear &c., is thus only inferentially known—all aggregates being for the sake of something distinct (from themselves). Hence¹ the reply given by the teacher—viz., that it is the ear of ear and so on—is quite apt. What then do the expressions—'the ear of ear' &c.,—signify? There is (apparently) no use of one ear to another, just as there is none of one light for another. This is no difficulty, for the following is the significance (of the expressions in the text). The ear, for instance, is known to be capable of making manifest its objects. This

1. All aggregates serving a definite purpose contain an implicit reference to an enjoyer outside of them; for, otherwise, the aggregates would be inexplicable. *Samhatānām parārthatvam.*

capability of the ear to manifest its objects, arises if the sentient illuminating Self,—eternal, detached and the inmost of all,—subsists and not when it does not. Hence the suitability of the reply given. Compare other *Vedic* texts (of similar import)—‘It endures by its own light’; ‘All this shines through its light’ (*Mund Up*: ii. ii. 10); ‘Kindled by whose light, the sun burns’ &c. We have in the *Bhagavadgītā* also—‘Whatever light in the sun makes the whole world shine &c’ (xv, 12); ‘O, *Bharata* thus does the Self illumine the whole body’ (xiii 33). In the *Kāthōpanishad* (ii. ii. 13) also we read—‘The one eternal of all eternal things, the one sentient principle in all &c.’ The ordinary belief is that the ear and the like are themselves the sentient Self. This (misconception) is here removed and (the teacher’s) reply—that there is something that can be comprehended (only) by the wise, and which is the inmost of all, constant, unborn, undecaying, immortal, fearless, and which, in respect of the ear &c., is the source of their functions¹—is, in its content as well as in its form, quite appropriate. Similarly it is the mind of mind—the internal sense. The mind would indeed be incapable of its functions—desiring and deciding—apart from the light of the

17. I read *ṣrōtrādisāmarthyanimittam* instead of *ṣrōtrādi tatsāmarthyanimittam*.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

sentient Self. Hence it (the mind) is said to be the mind of mind. Here *manas* and *buddhi*¹ are taken as one, and denoted by the single word *manas*. *yat vāchó ha vācham*. *yat* means 'since' and should be taken along with each of (the statements)—'the ear of ear' &c. The meaning is consequently—'Since it is the ear of ear, since it is the mind of mind' and so on. In the present statement the accusative *vācham* should be altered into the nominative (*vāk*) seeing (we have in the next clause) *prāṇasya prāṇaḥ*. Why should not the nominative (*prāṇaḥ* in the latter clause itself be altered into the accusative in conformity with what is found in the former. No; this cannot be done for we should follow (what is implied by) a greater number (of words). In the latter (clause) there are two words (*prāṇaḥ* and *saḥ*) in the nominative and, in accordance with this, *vācham* should be turned into *vāk*. There will thus be, as is but appropriate, conformity with what is numerically greater. Further it is customary, to designate the thing asked about in the nominative. *saḥ* i. e. that which you have questioned about. *prāṇasya*=of the breathing operation. *prāṇaḥ*= (breath). Breath's ability to breathe is due to it (Brahman), for nothing that is not presided over by the Self can possibly breathe. Compare—'Who

1. *Sankalpavikalpātmakam manasḥ; niṣchayātmikā buddhiḥ*.

could respire, who could breathe down, if there were not the bliss in the cave?' (*Tait. Up.* ii. 7); 'It leads up breath and brings it down' (*Kath. Up.* ii. ii. 3). It will presently be stated here also—'That by which *prāṇa* is prompted, know *that* alone to be Brahman' (It may be said that) while speaking of the organs of sense like the ear it is not quite so appropriate to refer to breath or *prāṇa* as to *ghrāṇa*, the organ of smell. Truly so; but it is intended by the text that the mention of *prāṇa* should imply the organ of smell as well. The point to be made known in this section is that *that* is Brahman for whose sake the totality of the senses employ themselves. Similarly it is the eye of eye (*chakshushah chakshuh*). The ability to comprehend form which is found in the eye,—the perceiver of form,—is conceivable only when that organ is presided over by the Self. Therefore it is (termed) 'the eye of eye.' Since a questioner desires to *know* that which he questions about, we have to supply here the word, *jñātvā* (having known) *i. e.*, having known Brahman which is, as described above, the ear of ear &c. (A further indication that this word should be supplied) is the mention (in the last *pāda*) of the result as being immortality. Immortality is attained through knowledge only. The statement 'having known and given up' means 'having given up in entirety the senses like the ear'. Mistaking the

Digitized by Anurag Sanjay Fandana, Chennai and eGangotri

ear and the like for the Self, one is born subject to their limitation,—conditioned by them—and dies and thus eternally transmigrates. Hence (the meaning is)—‘knowing that the Self is Brahman, the ear of ear &c. and giving up wrong beliefs such as identifying the Self with the ear &c.’ Those who discard this mistaken notion about the ear &c. being the Self are indeed wise men for without the highest wisdom the giving up of such misconceptions is impossible. *prētya* = turning away. *asmāt*=from this. *lokāt i. e.* selfish interests relating to sons, friends, wife and relations. In other words, it means ‘renouncing all kinds of desires’. *amṛitā bhavanti* = become endowed with immortality. Compare—‘Not by *karma*, not by offspring, not by wealth, but by renunciation only have a few attained immortality’; ‘The self-existent ruined the senses &c’ (*Kāth: Up: ii, i, 1*); ‘When all the heart’s desires are relinquished, then mortal man becomes immortal and enjoys liberation here’ (*Id. ii, iii, 14*). Or we may interpret ‘*asmāt lokāt prētya*’ as ‘going away from this body’ *i. e.* ‘dying’, since *atimuchya* by itself may be taken to signify renunciation of desires.¹

1. The first interpretation, refers to a knower who ceases to feel attachment to anything in the world, including his body, but who continues to live on this earth as his *prārabdha karma* that gave rise to his present life has not yet exhausted itself by bearing fruit. This state is known as *jīvanmukti*. The second interpretation refers to

3. Not there the eye goes ;
nor speech goes ; nor mind. We
do not know ; neither do we
understand how any one can
teach it.

As Brahman is the ear of ear &c., i.e., the Self of everything, the eye (*chakshuh*) does not reach (*na gachhati*) thither (*tatra*). For motion towards one's own self is impossible. Similarly speech does not go (there). Speech is said to reach what it expresses (or its object) when it is uttered by the organ of speech and its meaning is made manifest. Brahman being the Self of that word, as also of the organ which utters it, speech does not reach (thither) just as fire while it burns and illumines (other things) does neither burn itself nor illumine itself.¹ Neither does mind go there. Mind in the same manner desires or decides its objects which are other than itself but cannot desire or decide its own self ; and Brahman constitutes that self. Knowledge of a thing arises through the senses or the mind and because Brahman is not reached by either of these,

a knower attaining what is termed *videhamukti*—complete liberation—which results when a *jivanmukta* relinquishes his body.

1. I. e., as an object (*vishayatayā*) requiring illumination from outside.

we do not know of what nature it is. We are consequently unable to understand by what means any one can explain that Brahman to a disciple. Such is the sense of the passage. Whatever is perceivable by the senses, *that*, it is possible to indicate to others by genus, quality, function or relationship.¹ Brahman does not possess any of these differentia. Hence the difficulty in explaining its nature to disciples. The need is thus implied for special effort being made in teaching as well as in understanding (the subject).

Since the second half of the *mantra* may be taken to imply the absolute denial of all means of instruction (in respect of Brahman) the following statement is made to repudiate such implication. It is true that it is thus impossible to make another understand Brahman by means of evidence such as sense-perception, but it is quite possible to indicate its nature through *Sāstra*. With this view is cited the following text—

4. 'It is verily other than the known and beyond the unknown.'
So have we heard from the ancients who taught us that.

1. The following are, in order, the illustrative examples given in the *tika*— (i) This is a *Brāhmaṇa*. (ii) He is dark. (iii) This is one that cooks. (iv) He is the king's servant.

Anyat eva=quite different. *tat*=(that) *i.e.*, the entity in question, which has been declared to be the ear of ear &c., and which is beyond their reach. *viditāt*=from the known. It is, indeed, other than the known, (for) that is the known which is the direct object of knowing. Everything being known to some one or other, in some place or other, the whole of the manifest (Universe) may certainly be (classed under) 'the known'. The purport is that (Brahman) is different from the Universe. This may imply that, Brahman is then unknown (*avidita*); hence the text adds—*atho aviditāt adhi*. *atho*=and. *aviditāt*=from the reverse of the known *i. e.*, the unmanifest, *viz.* nescience, the source of the manifest. *adhi*=above; here it means secondarily, 'different'; for, as all know, whatever is above a thing is different from it. That which is known, being finite, mortal and of the nature of sorrow is to be shunned. Declaring Brahman to be other than the known thus means that it is other than what has to be shunned. Similarly declaring it to be other than the unknown amounts to saying that it is other than what may be acquired. It is for the sake of an effect that a cause which is different from it is sought by one that is different (from both). Hence as the individual Self is distinct from the means a_s

well as the end,¹ the expression 'other than the known and the unknown', by declaring that Brahman is distinct from what may be shunned or acquired, identifies it with the individual Self and thus satisfies the desire of the disciple to know Brahman. Nothing but one's own self can in reality² be different from both the known and the unknown.³ Thus the import of the ancient text is that the Self is Brahman. Compare other *Vedic* texts also—'This Self is Brahman' (*Br. Up.* II, v, 19); 'Which Self is untouched by sin' (*Ch. Up.* VIII, vii, 1); 'Which is immediate and primal—which Self is inmost of all' (*Br. Up.* III, iv, 1). It is now stated that the text⁴ which thus declares that the Self of all, devoid of all distinctions, whose light is that of pure sentiency, is Brahman, has been handed down traditionally. (It is intended that)

1. The text of the *bhāṣya* has probably become somewhat corrupt. Two readings are found in Mss. and printed books—one of them, as in the present edition, with only one *na* before *vedituh* or *bhavati*, and the other, as in the Calcutta and Madras editions, with a *na* before both *vedituh* and *bhavati*. The omission of both the *na*'s, appears to yield the best sense; but for such emendation there is not the authority of either of the two Mss. consulted in this translation.

2. I read *vastutah* for *vastunah*.

3. This statement presupposes a division of all entities into three classes—(i) *viditah* (ii) *aviditah* and (iii) *veditri*.

4. I read *valkyasya* instead of *valkyārthasya*.

Brahman should consequently be understood through the traditional teaching of preceptors and not by (oneself) reasoning (merely); nor by disquisition, mental power, learning, austerities, sacrifice and the like. *iti*=thus. *śruṣṭuma*=we have heard. *pūrvēśhām* i.e., the statement of ancient teachers. *yē*=which teachers. *naḥ*=to us. *tat*=Brahman. *vyāchakshirē*=explained or taught well.

5. That which is not expressed by words, but through which words are expressed ; *that* verily, know thou, is Brahman; it is not what (people) here worship.

When in the first half of the previous *mantra*, it was taught that the Self is Brahman, a doubt occurred to the hearer—‘ How can the Self be Brahman ? The Self is what is charged with the performance of *karma* and *upāsana*. Practising, during life, *kārma* or *upāsana* as an aid, it seeks to attain heaven or the position of gods such as that of *Brahmā*. Being the object of *upāsana* Brahman must be other than the Self—viz, *Vishnu*, *Iṣvara*, *Indra*, or *Prāṇa* ; but it can, under no circumstances, be the Self ; for that is contrary to the common sense of mankind. As rationalists say

that the Self is different from the Lord, so ritualists (also) worship deities other than the Self (as indicated by statements like) 'Sacrifice for such an one; sacrifice for such an one'. It is therefore to be concluded that Brahman is what is the object of worship and is thus *known* and that the worshipper is altogether distinct from it¹. (The teacher) perceiving such a doubt from the (facial) expression of the disciple or (perhaps knowing it) from his statements, says—'Do not doubt thus'. *Yat* i. e., which exists as mere sentiency. *vāchā*—*vāk* is the sensory organ producing sounds, presided over by *Agni* and located in eight places² such as the root of the tongue. It may also mean the syllables themselves, certain numbers of which placed in certain orders become definite signs (for conveying) certain meanings. Or the whole word itself considered as sound and suggested by these (separate syllables) may be termed *vāk*³.

1. The gist of the disciple's argument here is that the teaching of the previous *mantra*, viz. that the Self is Brahman, contradicts not merely the common belief of mankind but also heterodox and orthodox systems of philosophy like the *Nyāya* or the *Mīmāṃsā*.

2. *ashtau sthānāni varṇānām uraḥ kanthāḥ sirastāthā jihvāmūlam cha dantāścha nāsikoshthau cha tālu cha.*
||.

3. Having first interpreted *vāk* as the organ of speech, the commentator proceeds to give the other meaning of the term—'the manifested sound'. Here again there are two views both of which are recounted in the commentary.

Compare—'The syllable *a* is indeed all speech. and this speech, being manifested through mutes, semi-vowels and sibilants, becomes manifold and differentiates itself into various forms'¹. *vāchā* i.e., by that which becomes determined as words and is dependent (for its production) on the organs of speech and of which all this—metre, prose, song; truth and falsehood; are only varieties. *anabhyuditam*=not made known or not expressed. *yena* i.e., by which Brahman. *vāk abhyudyate* i.e., speech together with its sensory organ is made known or used by the sentient light in the sense to be conveyed. Compare what has already been stated—'Which is the speech of speech'—as also passages like the following in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakōpanishad*—'When speaking, speech' (I, iv, 7); 'Who controls speech from inside' (III, vii, 17). Again (elsewhere) having raised a question thus—'That speech which is in man is placed in sounds. Has any *Brāhmaṇa* understood it?', the reply is given—'That is speech by which (one) speaks in a dream'. That is the (true) speech of the speaker, eternal and of the nature of the sentient light. Compare—

Some thinkers hold that the *varṇas* themselves are the word and that the sense is conveyed directly through them. Others maintain that the word is different from the *varṇas* and is revealed by them. This word is eternal in its nature and is known as *sphōta* and through suggesting the *sphōta*, it is said, the *varṇas* convey the meaning only indirectly.

1. I read *saishā* for *saishāsya*.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and Bangalore
 'The speech of the speaker can never disappear'
 (Br. Up. IV, iii, 26). *tat eva* i.e. the Self only.
Brahma i.e. the supreme, known as the Infinite.
 It is called '*Brahman*' being great (from the root
brh. 'to grow'). *viddhi*=know. The significance
 of *eva* is as follows—Having discarded all definiti-
 ons of what is really indefinable, distinctionless,
 supreme and harmonious, through limiting
 adjuncts like speech—such as, 'the speech of
 speech', 'the eye of eye' and so forth, 'the agent,
 enjoyer, knower, controller and ruler', 'Brahman is
 knowledge, is bliss'—know that the Self only is
 Brahman. *na idam Brahma*=(not this the Brah-
 man). *yat idam* i.e. the conditioned, such as
Īsvara (conceived as) different from the Self.
upāsate=worship. Though it has already been
 stated 'That verily, know thou, is Brahman,' the
 fourth *pāda* adds that whatever is not Self is not
 Brahman for the sake of emphasis or for repudiat-
 ing the belief that anything but the Self could be
 Brahman.

6. That which is not thought
 by the mind, but by which, they
 say, the mind is thought; *that*
 verily, know thou, is Brahman;
 it is not what (people) here wor-
 ship.

Manas is the internal sense and is (here) used to signify both the *buddhi* and *manas*. *Manas* is that which thinks and is the common factor in all sensory (operations), being related to all kinds of objects. It is characterised by desire &c. as recorded in—'Desire, decision, doubt, faith, want of faith, boldness, cowardice, shame, intellect, fear, —all this is only mind.' (*Br. Up.* I, v, 3). *manasā*=(by means of such mind). *Yat i.e.* the light of intelligence, which is the illuminator of the mind, because Brahman is its controller, being the source of its light. *na manute i.e.* one does not decide or desire. The Self being the inmost of all objects, the mind cannot move towards it (which is its own self). (Rather) the mind itself is able to think only when it is illumined by the light of intelligence residing inside. Therefore, it is, that knowers of Brahman declare that the mind with all its functions is thought or pervaded by Brahman. Hence one should know that the Self of the mind, the internal cogniser, only is Brahman. The fourth *pāda* is to be understood as before.

7. That which is not seen by the eye, but by which eyes are seen; *that* verily, know thou, is Brahman; it is not what (people) here worship.

Chakshushā=by the eye operating with (the aid of) mind. *na paśyati* i. e. one does not perceive. *chakshāmshi* i. e. the operations of the eye as distinguished from those of the mind. *paśyati*=knows or pervades, through its inherent light of intelligence. The rest (of the *mantra* should be understood) as before.

8. That which is not heard by the ear but by which ears are heard; *that* verily, know thou, is Brahman ; it is not what (people) here worship.

Srōtram, a transformation of space, presided over by the deities of space and acting in conjunction with the mind. The rest (to be understood) as before.

9. That which is not breathed by *prāna* but through which *prana* breathes; *that* verily, know thou, is Brahman ; it is not what (people) here worship.

Prāna=*ghrāṇa*=the organ of smell, a transformation of elemental earth, located in the nostrils and acting conjointly with breath and mind. *na prāṇiti*=does not perceive, as for instance, (it does), odour. The rest (to be understood) as before.

End of the First Section.

SECOND SECTION.

1. If thou thinkest that thou hast understood (Brahman) well, thou knowest it but in a small (form), whether it refer (to the individualised Self) or to gods; and thou, I think, hast yet to investigate (it).—I think I understand.

Lest the disciple who has been taught that he (himself) is Brahman, the reverse of what can be shunned or acquired, should think 'I know well; I myself am Brahman', the teacher states as above and (desires to) test the pupil's knowledge. Should not clear conviction in the pupil that he has understood well, be welcome to the teacher? True, clear conviction is welcome; but not in the form 'I know (Brahman) well' for it is possible to *know* only that which can be an object of consciousness, as, for instance, in the case of burning a thing that can be burnt by the burning fire; but not the nature of fire itself. The final import of all the Upanishads is that the Self of all the knowers is Brahman. Here also the same has been set

forth in the form of an answer to a question in i, 2. and specially affirmed in i, 5. The traditional faith of knowers of Brahman has been indicated in i, 4 and the topic will hereafter be concluded (in the same strain) in ii, 3. Thus it is but right to remove from (the mind of) the disciple (the idea) that he knows Brahman well. Certainly the knowing principle in the knower cannot be known as the burning principle in fire cannot be burnt. Nor indeed is there a knower, other than Brahman, to whom it may become an object of consciousness. The text—'There is no knower other than that' (Br : Up : III, viii, 11) denies a second knower, from which (we may conclude that) the belief that Brahman is *known* is altogether illusory. The teacher is thus right in stating as above.

Yadi=if ever. *manyasé*=(you think). *su veda iti* i.e., 'I know Brahman very well'. (The teacher) speaks thus conditionally because an intelligent pupil, whose sins are at an end, does comprehend what is taught, though it be difficult of comprehension ; while another (who is dull) does not. It is also known that as recounted in *Ch.Up:* (VII, v) the learned *Viróchana*, the lord of *asuras* and son of *Prajápati*, when taught the nature of the Self, owing to his inherent sin, thought that the body was the Self, although such a view was untenable, being the very opposite of what was meant. Again *Indra*, the lord of gods, unable to comprehend the

same when taught once, twice and a third time understood correctly what was meant from the very beginning only on the fourth occasion—thus biding (his time for) the removal of his original deficiency. In our experience also, though taught by the same teacher, some understand rightly, some wrongly, some differently and others not at all. What shall we say (of the present subject)—the entity of Self which is supersensuous! There is in respect of this subject great divergence (of opinion) among enquirers—some saying 'It exists'; others 'It does not'. Thus—because it is difficult of comprehension—the teacher is right in speaking conditionally with an 'if', although the disciple has, after due reflection, declared that he has understood Brahman. *dabhram*=small. *eva*=(quite). *api*=(and). *nūnam*=(indeed). *tvam*=(you). *vètttha*=know. *Brahmanah*=of Brahman. *rūpam*=form. Are there many forms of Brahman—some small, others great—that you say 'quite small?' Yes; many indeed are the forms of Brahman resulting from the limitations of name and form; but in itself (Brahman) is not so. In itself, it is devoid of all forms, as also of sound and so forth as recorded in *Kāthōpanishad* (I, iii, 15)—'Devoid of sound, of touch, of form; imperishable; so also is it—the eternal—without flavour or odour?'

Well, since that by which a thing is defined forms its essence, that by which Brahman is

defined must constitute its essence. Hence we may say that *chaitanya* or sentiency, which is not the essence of any of the elements like earth, or of their transformations—taken individually or in totality—or either of the organs of sense like the ear and the inner sense, constitutes the nature or essence of Brahman, and that Brahman is accordingly characterised by sentiency. There are also Vedic texts (favouring such a view). Compare—‘Brahman is knowledge, bliss’ (*Br : Up. III ix, 8*); ‘Wholly solid sentiency’ (*Br. Up. II, iv 12*): ‘Intelligence is Brahman’ (*Ait : Up v, 3*); ‘Existence, sentiency, infinite is Brahman’ (*Tait : Up : II, i, 1*)—all of which describe Brahman (in terms of sentiency). Truly so; but even there Brahman is defined as sentiency and so forth, through its limiting adjuncts viz., the mind, the body and the various organs of sense, for (Brahman) reflects their (characteristics) in their growth, contraction, suspense, destruction and so on; but, in itself, it does not (undergo any change whatever), and is, as will hereafter be established, ‘unknown to the knower and known only to those that do not know it.’ *yat*=which. *asya* i.e. of this. These words are to be taken with *brahmanō rūpam*. It is not merely what you know of Brahman in its form of the individualised Self that is small; but also what you know of Brahman in its divine form. Thus I think. Whatever is human or divine is

limited by adjuncts and is not thus different from smallness or finitude. But *that* Brahman which shakes off all adjuncts, is peaceful, endless, one without a second, known as *bhūman* (that which is much) and eternal, is not at all an object of knowledge. This is the purport of the passage. Hence I think (*manye*) that even now it (Brahman) remains to be investigated (*mimāmsyam*) by you (*tē*). The disciple, thus addressed by the teacher, sitting in a solitary place and concentrating his thoughts, pondered over the meaning of the text quoted by the teacher and having come to a decision through reasoning and intuitive experience, approached the teacher and said—*manye veditam* i. e. 'I think that Brahman is now understood by me'. How? Pray, listen—

2. I do not at all think I know well ; nor that I do not know ; but know too. And he among us knows it who knows this—
'Not that I do not know; but know too'.

The first *pāda* means—'I do not at all think I know Brahman well'. The second *pāda* meaning 'I do certainly know, is¹ in answer to the

1. I read *vedaiveti* in place of *vedacheti*.

objection, viz. ' You do not in that case understand Brahman '. By the force of *cha* (after *veda* we have to understand) *na veda cha* (i. e. ' I do not know either). Does not all this involve a contradiction? If you think you do not know well, how can you say you know also? If you, on the other hand, think you know, how is it you do not think you know well? When a thing is known by one, it is a self-contradiction to say that the same is not known, unless it be a case of doubt or delusion. Brahman, to be sure, it cannot be held, is to be known doubtfully or wrongly for doubt and error are everywhere known to cause only evil. The pupil, though thus shaken (in his belief) by the teacher, did not waver owing to the influence of the traditional teaching imparted to him in i, 4, and of his reasoned and intuitive conviction, but thundered forth evincing his firm belief in the knowledge of Brahman. How? As follows—*yo nastadveda tadveda no na vedeti veda-cha*. *Yah*=whoever. *nah*=among us, fellow students. *tat* i. e., the above statement. *veda*=understands rightly. *tat*=(Brahman). *veda*=(knows). What is that statement? The fourth *pāda* furnishes the answer. (The disciple) here repeats—as confirmed by reason and intuitive perception—what was stated by the teacher in the first half of i, 4, (but) in different words so that it may fall in with the view of the teacher and thus remove from

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri
his mind any mistaken idea that the disciple is dull. The disciple is thus justified in proclaiming as he did.

Dropping the form of a dialogue between the teacher and his disciple, the *Sruti* now inculcates¹ directly what forms the essence of the whole of the preceding conversation—

3. To whomsoever it is not known, to him it is known; to whomsoever it is known, he does not know. Unknown to knowers and known (only) to those that do not know.

Yasya=to a knower of Brahman. *amatam*=not known i.e., whose conviction is that Brahman is not an object of knowledge. *tasya*=to such a knower. *matam* i. e., Brahman is clear. *matam yasya na veda saḥ* i. e., whoever, on the other hand, believes that he apprehends Brahman, does not at all understand (the nature of Brahman). (The second half of the *mantra*) merely reaffirms these statements relating to knowers and the ignorant. *avijnātam*=unknown i. e., Brahman is not an object of knowledge. *vijānatam*=to true knowers.

1. I read *arthamavabódhayati* instead of *arthameva bódhayati*.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri
vijnātam = known (i.e. is an object of knowledge.)
avijānatam = to those that do not know properly.
 The word (*avijānatām*) refers only to such as mis-
 take the senses, mind or intellect for the Self and
 not to the absolutely uncultured, for the latter
 never feel that they have understood Brahman.
 In the case of those, however, that mistake adjuncts
 like the senses, mind or intellect, for the Self,
 the delusion that Brahman is apprehended by them
 is quite possible, because they do not perceive the
 distinction between Brahman and its adjuncts,
 which are clearly knowable. The statement in
pāda 4 is for indicating the *prima facie* view. Or,
 the second half (in its entirety) may be viewed as
 assigning a reason (for what has been stated in
 the first half.)¹

It has been declared that (Brahman) is not
 known to knowers. If Brahman be thus totally
 unknown to them, there will then be no distinction
 whatever between ordinary persons and knowers.

1. To take the ordinary illustration of a person mis-
 taking mother-of-pearl for silver. To one that knows it is
 mother-of-pearl the superimposed silver does not at all
 appear; but to one that is ignorant of its real nature, the
 superimposed idea occurs. Stating the same in general terms,
 —those that know the 'reality' do not perceive the 'appear-
 ance' and those who perceive the 'appearance' do not
 know the 'reality'. Similarly in the present case also
 where *jñātatva* or 'being known as an object' is superimposed
 upon Brahman and does not in reality pertain to its nature.

Further, the statement 'unknown to knowers' is self-contradictory. How then can such Brahman be understood properly? In answer to such a question, is said—

4. (When Brahman) is known through every state of consciousness, (it then) is rightly known; for (by such knowledge) one attains immortality. Through one's own self doth real power come; and through self-knowledge comes immortality.

Prati bódha viditam means 'perceived in every state of consciousness'. The word *bódha* refers to 'mental states'. The Self to which all mental states become objects of knowledge is known through every one of those states.¹ The witness of all mental operations, whose essence is mere sentiency, is implied by those operations themselves as being the common element of them all. There is no other means of knowing the inner Self. Hence the meaning is that when Brahman is known as the inmost essence of mental perceptions, then, that is *matam* or right knowledge. When once

1. As heat, for instance, is known through every heated object.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Calcutta and eGangotri
vijnātam = known (i.e. is an object of knowledge.)
avijānatam = to those that do not know properly.
 The word (*avijānatām*) refers only to such as mis-
 take the senses, mind or intellect for the Self and
 not to the absolutely uncultured, for the latter
 never feel that they have understood Brahman.
 In the case of those, however, that mistake adjuncts
 like the senses, mind or intellect, for the Self,
 the delusion that Brahman is apprehended by them
 is quite possible, because they do not perceive the
 distinction between Brahman and its adjuncts,
 which are clearly knowable. The statement in
pāda 4 is for indicating the *prima facie* view. Or,
 the second half (in its entirety) may be viewed as
 assigning a reason (for what has been stated in
 the first half.)¹

It has been declared that (Brahman) is not
 known to knowers. If Brahman be thus totally
 unknown to them, there will then be no distinction
 whatever between ordinary persons and knowers.

1. To take the ordinary illustration of a person mis-
 taking mother-of-pearl for silver. To one that knows it is
 mother-of-pearl the superimposed silver does not at all
 appear; but to one that is ignorant of its real nature, the
 superimposed idea occurs. Stating the same in general terms,
 —those that know the 'reality' do not perceive the 'appear-
 ance' and those who perceive the 'appearance' do not
 know the 'reality'. Similarly in the present case also
 where *jñātatva* or 'being known as an object' is superimposed
 upon Brahman and does not in reality pertain to its nature.

Further, the statement 'unknown to knowers' is self-contradictory. How then can such Brahman be understood properly? In answer to such a question, is said—

4. (When Brahman) is known through every state of consciousness, (it then) is rightly known; for (by such knowledge) one attains immortality. Through one's own self doth real power come; and through self-knowledge comes immortality.

Prati bódha veditam means 'perceived in every state of consciousness'. The word *bódha* refers to 'mental states'. The Self to which all mental states become objects of knowledge is known through every one of those states.¹ The witness of all mental operations, whose essence is mere sentiency, is implied by those operations themselves as being the common element of them all. There is no other means of knowing the inner Self. Hence the meaning is that when Brahman is known as the inmost essence of mental perceptions, then, that is *matam* or right knowledge. When once

1. As heat, for instance, is known through every heated object.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri

Brahman is admitted to be the witness of all mental perceptions, it follows, that it is of the nature of sentiency, without beginning or end, eternal, pure in form, identical with oneself, devoid of distinctions and one in all beings, for there is no distinguishing feature (between one such witness and another)—as in the case of space for instance (encompassed by) a jar or a mountain cave. Thus the teaching of the *Vedic* text that Brahman is different from the known as well as from the unknown is summarised here as referring to the unqualified (higher Brahman). Compare another *Vedic* text—'The seer of sight, hearer of hearing, thinker of thought, knower of knowledge'.

When, however, *pratibòdhaviditam* is interpreted as 'known by the characteristic act of knowing', on the supposition that Brahman is the agent in the act of knowing and that the agent is known through his action, *viz.*, knowing, as for instance, in the case of the wind which may be indicated by its shaking the branches of trees, the Self becomes a mere substance possessing the faculty of knowing and not knowledge itself. Knowledge (only) appears and disappears in it. When knowledge appears, the Self becomes distinguishable by the act of knowing; when knowledge disappears, then, being dissociated from knowing, it becomes a mere (unintelligent) substance. Hence it will (in this view) be impossible to get over the

objection that Brahman is changeable, composed of parts, transient, impure and so on.

According to the followers of *Kanāda*, however, knowledge arises from contact of the Self with the mind and inheres (as a quality) in the Self, which is consequently spoken of as a 'knower'. Thus the Self does not change (through knowing as in the previous view). Being a substance (it becomes endowed with the attribute of knowledge,) as a jar becomes associated with its particular colour (when it comes in contact with fire).¹ This view also makes Brahman a mere substance, devoid of intelligence and contradicts texts like—'Brahman is knowledge, bliss' (*Br. Up.* III ix 8); 'Intelligence is Brahman' (*Ait. Up.* v. 3). Further (the mind cannot come into contact with the Self) as it is without parts and has consequently no surface (where contact may take place). (If contact be

1. The distinction between the two views here criticised should be noticed. According to the first view, knowledge is an *act* and the Self is what *knows*; according to the second, knowledge is a *quality* and inheres, like all qualities, in the Self, but requires for its manifestation the previous contact of the Self with the mind. The *siddhānta* view also makes *jñāna* an act or *kriyā* but it is only what is termed *vr̥tti jñāna* or ordinary mental perception. Thus only the mind becomes changeable through the act of knowing but not the Self. What constitutes the essence of the Self—*svārūpa jñāna*—is neither an act, nor a quality. It is eternal and subsists in itself. 'The soul is not a knower, but knowledge; not intelligent, but intelligence.'

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri

inferred from the fact that the Self is pervading and) is therefore in intimate union (with everything)¹, it will be impossible to maintain that remembrance can (as is admitted by all) arise only under definite conditions.² It would, moreover, by making the Self susceptible of attachment, clash with statements in the *śrutis* and *smṛitis* and with reason as well. Compare—'Being unattached it does not cling (to any thing)' (*Br. Up.* III, ix, 26) 'Unattached and yet holding all' (*Bh. Gi.* xiii, 14). As for reason. Only a thing with attributes can combine with another—also possessing attributes ;

1. This sentence is highly elliptical and the interpretation given by the *likākāra* has been followed in translating it. A semi-colon may, for the sake of clearness, be placed after *pradesābhāvāt*.

2. The fact admitted by all, to which reference is made here, is that remembrance of a thing is only after it has been perceived. The position of the opponent is this—Being *vibhu*, the Self is in eternal union with all things and so with mind as well. It cannot therefore be maintained that the Self will not come into contact with the mind because it does not present a surface where contact may take place. This position is refuted as follows—If the Self be always in intimate union with the mind, objects should be remembered not merely after perception but during perception as well, when also the required conditions—the union of the mind with the Self and the reviving cause which, in the present case, is the object itself—exist. Such a conclusion is subversive of the fundamental notions about the difference between perception and memory.

but not with what is dissimilar. Hence it is against reason (to hold) that what is unqualified, devoid of distinction, different from everything, unites or comes into contact with anything of a different nature. Thus the conclusion that Brahman is the Self, eternal and of the nature of never-disappearing intelligence, can be established only when the Self is identical with the witness of all perceptions and not otherwise. Therefore the meaning of *pratibôdhaviditam* is as we have explained.

Again, if *pratibôdhaviditam* be explained as referring to 'knowing by one's own self', (we have to say that) such an explanation is applicable only to the conditioned Self, distinguished, on account of its adjunct viz. the mind, from the pure Self, as in—'He discovers the Self in himself' (*Ch. Up.* IV iv, 23); 'Thou, best of men, know thyself in thyself' (*Bh. Gi.* x, 15) &c. If, on the other hand, the Self is (taken as) unconditioned and therefore one, it can neither be known by itself nor by anything else. Moreover, being itself sentiency, (the Self) does not need another sentient principle (to know itself), just as one light does not stand in need of another light.

If we understand Self-consciousness in the Buddhistic sense, knowledge becomes momentary and the (continuous principle of the) Self

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and Gangotri
 is eliminated,¹ which again contradicts texts like, 'There is no disappearance of the knowledge of the knower, because it always persists' (*Br. Up.* IV, iii, 30); 'Eternal, mighty and pervading' (*Mund. Up.* I. 6); 'That indeed is the great unborn Self, undecaying, undying, immortal, and fearless' (*Br. Up.* IV. iv, 25).

As regards the interpretation by others of *pratibôdhaviditām* as causeless or intrinsic knowledge², as in deep sleep³ or sudden enlighten-

1. If we grant that knowledge perceives itself, then since perception can refer only to what exists in the present moment, knowledge in one moment cannot perceive knowledge in the next moment. There being thus no continuous perception of knowledge, it becomes momentary, as indeed every thing is according to the school of Buddhist philosophers here referred to (*vaināśikās*). Again, when we grant that knowledge is self-perceiving, there will be no need to postulate, as is done in the *Vēdānta*, the existence of a *sākṣī* or a persisting witness of all mental notions and the continuous principle of the Self thus becomes eliminated from the system.

2. According to this interpretation *pratibôdha* means what is familiar to students of *Yôga* as *asamprajñāta-samādhi* which ranks higher than *samprajñātasamādhi* or conscious *samādhi*. It is pure absorption which restores to Selfhood the devotee who has gradually released himself from all the trammels of the *upādhis* inclusive of the mind.

3. The happiness of perfect tranquility experienced during sleep is stated to be the result of such intrinsic intelligence, the same not being attributable to any extraneous cause.

ment¹, (we have to state that) whether knowledge be intrinsic or extrinsic, sudden or recurring—it (the Self) is still what is known through a state of consciousness.² *amritatvam*=deathlessness i.e. abiding in one's own self, liberation. *hi*=because. *vindatē*=obtains. That is, since (liberation is attained by means of) what is known through states of consciousness, what is so known is assuredly rightly known. The Self is the inmost essence of a notion³ and knowledge relating to the Self is the cause of immortality. Becoming what is non-Self can never be said to form immortality and since immortality is but being one's own self it cannot be caused by anything extraneous. Similarly mortality for the Self is due to mistaking it, from nescience, for what is different from it⁴.

1. When Brahman is realised, the devotee loses his individualised form and, there being thus no scope for any further mental operation, the final perception resulting in *Brahma-realisation* is termed *sakridvijñānam*, which literally means 'knowledge for once.' *Akriyabrahmātmātvaṇnuabhavē sati pramāṭṛtvānupapattau punarjñāna-sambhavāt, sadyōmuktikāraṇam sakridvijñānam pratibodhaḥ.*—*Tikā*.

2. Thus the meaning of the expression as originally explained is re-affirmed.

3. I read *bōdhasya hi pratyak ātmā; ātma-*vi*śaya-*tvam* cha amṛtatvāḥ hētuḥ.*

4. The function of true knowledge is merely to remove this mistaken notion—that the Self is something different from what it really is and not to *effect* or *generate* *mōksha* newly.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri

How then does one attain immortality through such self-knowledge? This question is answered in the second half of the *mantra*. *ātmanā* = by one's own self. *vindatē* = obtains. *viryam* = strength or power. Power due to wealth, assistance, incantations, magic herbs, austerities and application cannot overcome death, for it is derived from transient things. The power of self-knowledge, on the other hand, is got through one's own self and not through anything else. Thus—since the power of self-knowledge is derived from nothing extraneous, that power is able to conquer death. Because the power of self-knowledge is got through oneself, it follows that by self-knowledge (*vidyayā*) immortality (*amṛtatvam*) is attained. The condition laid down for achieving immortality is quite suitable because we find recorded in another *Upa-nishad* (*Mundaka*)—'This Self is not to be reached by one devoid of strength' (III, ii, 4)¹.

5. If one should know here, then there is use; if one should not here know (there results) great loss. Hence, seeking (Reality) in all beings, wise men become immortal after death.

1. The strength arising from knowledge is this—that one is in reality absolutely free—and the consequent sense of security leads one to the happiness of peace.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri

To experience—through nescience—birth, decay, death, disease and so on in the form of beings—whether as gods or men or beasts or manes—all thick with the sorrows of life—is indeed a misery. If (*chét*) one that is qualified and capable knew (*avédit*) the Self in this human life (*iha*), then (*atha*) there would be permanence, utility, goodness or reality (*satyam*).¹ *Na cha iha avédit* i.e. if one, thus qualified, did not find it out in this life. *mahatī vinashtih* i.e., long or infinite ruin follows, in the form of metempsychosis, characterised by the infinite and unbroken series of birth, decay and death. Thus wise *Brāhmanas* (*dhirāḥ*) that can discriminate between good and evil (do as follows)—*bhūtēshu bhūtēshu*=in all beings whether movable or immovable. *vichitya* i.e., discovering or realising the one Reality of the Self. *dhirāḥ*=wise men. *prētya* i.e., turning back and ceasing to take part in this shadowy life, characterised by *meum* and *tuum* and identifying themselves with the non-

1. To the four meanings of *satyam* given in the commentary, the *tīkā* adds four more—'birth', 'long life', 'wealth', 'reputation' and states that these also result from *Brahma-knowledge*. The object of mentioning them in the present case, however, is only to glorify that knowledge. The one true result yielded by it and intended to be prominently mentioned here is 'the attainment of *Brahma*-hood itself' and its statement in the last *pāda* of the *mantra* indicates the prominence that is to be given to it in recounting the uses of *Brahma-knowledge*. The other rewards are mentioned here only by the way.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai on the 6th of March 2012
 dual, all-encompassing Truth. *amṛta śāśvanti-*
 (become immortal) i.e. become Brahman itself as
 recorded in the text—'He who knows the supreme
 Brahman indeed becomes Brahman itself' (*Mund :*
Up: III, ii, 9).

End of the Second Section.

THIRD SECTION.

1. Brahman, it is said, conquered (once) for the gods and the gods gloried in that conquest of Brahman. They thought—'Ours is this victory, and ours alone, this greatness.'

Whatever *is*, is known, through (one or other of the instruments of knowledge; whatever *is not*, is not known and is absolute nothing as, for example, a hare's horn. And Brahman, because it is not known, should also be nothing. Lest the dull-witted, hearing what has been stated in the second half of ii, 3, delude themselves thus, the following episode is narrated. It is this same Brahman which controls (all) in all respects, which is god higher than all gods, the over-lord of all lords, incomprehensible, the source of victory for the gods and of defeat for the demons. How can it be nothing? The subsequent passages contain sentiments favouring such a view. Or (it may be understood as) glorifying self-knowledge. How? Through self-knowledge did divine *Agni* and others attain pre-emi-

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and the Gangaotri
 nence among gods and *Indra*, greater (pre-emi-
 nence) still. Or again (we may say that) the episode
 shows how difficult it is to comprehend Brahman.
 Thus with much difficulty did *Agni* and others—
 the very mightiest—know Brahman. Similarly *In-*
dra also, the king of the gods. Or (we may under-
 stand that) the whole (episode) is (narrated) in refer-
 ence to the injunction (to contemplate Brahman) as
 hereinafter given (in iv, 6)¹ or the episode
 (may be viewed as) pointing out—in contrast to
 Brahma-knowledge—that the ordinary belief of
 beings that they are agents, enjoyers and so forth
 is but illusory, like the belief of the gods in
 respect of their victory.

Brahman i. e., the Supreme described above.
ha=it is said. *dēvēbhyaḥ*=for the sake of gods.
vijigye=conquered. In the strife between the gods
 and the demons, (Brahman) vanquishing the
 demons, the enemies of the world and breakers of
 the divine law, transferred to the gods its victory
 together with its results, for the stability of the
 world. *tasya Brahmanah*=of that Brahman. *ha*.
 (This is for emphasis merely). *vijaye*=in (victory).
dēvāḥ=(gods) such as *Agni*. *amahiyaṇta*=became

1. According to the *tikāḥ*, this is the explanation
 most acceptable to the commentator, since in what follows
 in section iv, there is found a specific injunction to meditate
 upon Brahman. The other explanations are suggested as
 being only possible.

great. *i.e.* those gods, not realising then that the victory and glory were of Brahman who abides in themselves as their inner Self, the Lord, omniscient, the bestower of all fruits of *karma* to all beings, omnipotent, and desirous of the sustained existence of the Universe. *īkshanta*=thought as follows—*asmākam ēva ayam vijayah*=ours alone, this victory. *asmākam ēva ayam mahimā*=ours alone, this greatness, achieved by us *Agni* and the rest in our individualised forms. *iti*=thus. We enjoy our positions as *Agni*, *Vāyu*, *Indra* and so on in virtue of our victory. This is not due to the Lord residing in us.

2. They say, it understood that (feeling of the gods) and appeared before them ; (but) they did not know what the venerable Being was.

Tat=Brahman. *ha*=it is said. *ēshām i.e.*, of gods who were thus feeling falsely. For Brahman is the witness of all beings, the propelling power of all their organs of sense. Knowing this false belief of the gods and pitying them, lest they also, like the demons, meet with defeat in consequence of their false pride and desiring to favour them by removing that pride, it appeared (*prādurbabhāva*) for their good before them (*tēbhyaḥ*). That is, it showed itself.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Education Centre, Chennai and Bangalore
 before their organs of sense in a most mighty and
 awe-inspiring form created by its great *yógic* power¹,
tat=Brahman who thus appeared. *na vyajánata*
 =the gods did not at all understand. *kim*=what?
idam=this. *yaksham*=adorable (being). *iti*=thus.

3. They said to *Agni* ‘O
Játavédas, find this out—what
 this venerable Being is.’ ‘Yes’
 (he said.)

Tè i.e. the gods who did not understand (what
 the apparition was), feeling afraid inwardly and
 wishing to know. *Agnim*=to *Játavédas*, their
 leader who is practically omniscient. *abruvan*=
 said. *Játavéda*=(O *Agni*). *état* i.e., this Being
 which has appeared before us. *vijánthi*=find out
 definitely what it is; for you are the most brilliant
 among us. *tathá iti i. e.*, he said ‘yes’.

4. He hastened towards it
 and it said to him ‘Who art
 thou?’. (*Agni*) replied—‘I am
Agni indeed, I am *Játavédas*.’

1. *Yōga* is explained in the *Ukā* as the union of the
 three fundamental *gunas* of *sattvam*, *rajas* and *tamas* and
 hence as signifying *māyā śakti*.

Tat abhyadravat i.e., Agni went towards it—the apparition. tam i. e., Agni who came near and desired to speak but, being stunned, remained silent before it. abhyavadat i. e., the apparition said—‘Who are you?’ (kósiti). Thus asked by Brahman, Agni said (abravit), in self-esteem—Agniḥ vai aham asmi iti; Játavédā vai aham asmi iti i.e., well-famed, as Agni and Játavédas—by this double name.

5. (The Being asked *Agni*)—
‘What strength in thee, thus famed?’ (*Agni*) replied—‘I can burn all this that is on earth.’

Brahman said to him who thus replied—*Tasmin tvayi i. e., in you thus famed, from name and power. kim viryam=what strength? He replied—idam sarvam=all this. dahéyam=I can turn to ashes. yat idam i.e., whatever is—such as immovable things. prthivyám=on the earth. iti=thus. The word prthivi is here used in an indicative sense, for the fire can burn whatever is in the heavens as well.*

6. (The Being) placed before him a straw, saying ‘Burn this.’ (*Agni*) went towards it with all his might, but could not burn it;

and he returned thence and said,
 'I have not been able to find out
 what venerable Being this is.'

Tasmai i. e., before *Agni* so proud. *trnam*=
 straw. *nidadhau* i. e., Brahman placed. It said—
état=this. *daha*=burn. *iti*=thus. Thus told by
 Brahman and asked by it to give up his false pride
 that he can burn all, if he failed to burn it, *Agni*
 went towards it (*tat upaprédya*) with all enthu-
 siastic pride (*sarvajavéna*.) Having gone (he) did
 not succeed (*na śaśāka*) in burning (*dagdhum*) it
 (*tat*). *saḥ* i. e., *Jātavédas* who was ashamed because
 he was unable to burn it and had thus broken his
 word. *tata éva*=from that Being. *nivavṛté* i. e.,
 returned silently to the gods (saying) 'I have not
 been able (*na aśakam*) to know (*vijnátum*) what
 the venerable Being is (*kim état yaksham iti*).'

7. They said to *Vāyu*—'O
Vāyu, find this out—what this
 venerable Being is.' 'Yes', (he
 said).

8. He hastened towards it
 and it said to him 'Who art
 thou?'. (*Vāyu* replied)—'I am
Vāyu indeed ; I am *Mátarisvá*.'

9. (The Being asked *Vāyu*)—
‘What strength in thee thus
famed?’ (*Vāyu*) replied—‘I can
carry all this that is on earth’.

10. (The Being) placed be-
fore him a straw saying ‘Take it
up.’ (*Vāyu*) went towards it with
all his might but could not take
it; and he returned thence and
said ‘I have not been able to find
out what this venerable Being is—’

Atha=then. *Vāyum*—so called because he blows
or carries fragrance with him. *mātariṣvā*—one
that moves (*ṣvayati*) in the heavens (*mātari*).
ādadiya=I can carry. The rest (to be understood)
as before.

11. Then they said to *Indra*—
‘O *Maghavan*, find this out—what
this venerable Being is’. ‘Yes’
he said. He hastened towards
it (but) it disappeared from
before him.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri

Indra=the great lord (of gods). *maghavā*—so called because he has many sacrifices (to his credit)¹. *tāsmāt* i. e., from *Indra* who had approached it. *tat* i. e. Brahman. *tirōdadhe*=disappeared—to humiliate him the more for his pride, as the lord (of all gods). And *Indra* could not even speak to it.

12. In the same place he met a woman—most beautiful—(*Umā*), the daughter of *Himavān* and said to her—‘What is this venerable Being?’

Tasmin ēva ākādse i. e., in the same place where the Being showed itself and disappeared and where *Indra* himself was, at the time of its disappearance. *Indra* stood in the same place wondering what that apparition was and did not return like *Agni* and *Vāyu*. Knowledge in the disguise of *Umā* appeared before him, seeing his devotion to the Being (that had appeared.) *saḥ*=*Indra*. *tām* i. e., *Umā*. *bahusōbhamānām*=(most beautiful)—Knowledge is surely the most beautiful of all that is beautiful. As applied to knowledge the epithet is very appropriate. *Haimavatīm*=decorated with golden ornaments i. e. beautiful as if decorated with golden ornaments. Or we may

1. I read *yajnavattvāt* instead of *balavattvāt*.

interpret this as 'daughter of *Himavān*' because *Umad* is such. *Indra* approached her (with his question) for she being always by the side of the all-knowing Brahman knows it. *tām* i.e. *Umad*. *ha*=it is said. *uvācha* i.e. asked as follows—
kim état yaksham iti i.e. what is this Being which, having shown itself (for a while), has disappeared ?

End of the Third Section.

FOURTH SECTION.

1. She replied—'This is Brahman, to be sure, and you but glory thus, verily, in its victory.' Then only he knew it was Brahman.

She said '*Brahma iti*' i. e. (this is Brahman), *ha*=to be sure. *Brahmanah*=of Brahman, the Lord. *vai*=verily. *vijaye*=(in victory). The demons were conquered by Brahman itself and you were but instruments therein. In its victory you glory. *etat*=(so much)—to be taken with the verb. Your belief—'ours alone is this victory; ours alone, this greatness' is merely illusory. *tatah* i.e., from that reply of *Uṃā*. *eva*=only. *vidāṃchakāra* i.e. (*Indra*) understood. *Brahma iti*=as Brahman. The emphasis on *tatah* (indicated by *eva*) points out (that *Indra* did) not (know it) independently (but only when instructed by some one else).

2. Thence indeed are these gods—*Agni*, *Vāyu* and *Indra*—above other gods, for they, it

was, that touched Brahman closest; for they, it was, that first understood Brahman.

Since these gods—*Agni*, *Vāyu* and *Indra*—went nearest Brahman by conversing with it and seeing it, they (*ētē devāḥ*) therefore (*tasmāt*) by their excellences—their happy lot of possessing power and virtue—greatly (*atitarām*) surpass other gods (*anyān devān*). *iva* after *atitarām* is an expletive merely or (may be taken as) emphatic in its significance. *yadagnirvāyurindraḥ*—viz., *Agni*, *Vāyu* and *Indra*. *tē*=those gods. *hi*=since. *ēnat* i.e. Brahman. *nēdishṭham*=nearest, dearest. *pasparṣuḥ*=touched Brahman i.e., through conversation &c., as narrated above. *tē*=they. *hi*=because. *ēnat* i.e. Brahman. *prathamāḥ*=*prathamāḥ*=being first or foremost. *vidāmchakāra*=*vidāmchakruḥ*=(understood). *Brahmaṇīti*=as Brahman.

3. Hence indeed is *Indra* more than other gods, for he, it was, that touched it closest; for he, it was, that first understood Brahman.

Agni and *Vāyu* also learnt only from *Indra*'s statement, who first heard from *Uṃā* that

it was Brahman, therefore (*tasmāt*) does Indra surpass greatly other gods. The rest has already been explained.

4. This is an illustration of it (Brahman) as relating to its divine form :—as the flashing of lightning ; and the twinkling (of the eye).

Tasya=of Brahman. *eshaḥ*=the following *ādeṣaḥ*=statement of a parallel. By *ādeṣa* is (here) meant the giving of a parallel instance to Brahman who is (really) without a parallel. What is it ? *yad ētat* i. e. what is well-known to all. *vidyutaḥ vyadyutat*—This is interpreted as 'the flashing of lightning', for (taking it literally) the expression means 'derived its light from lightning' which however, is inappropriate (in regard to Brahman which is self-luminous). *ā* indicates similarity. The expression thus means—'like the flash of lightning', as is also recorded in another text—'Like sudden lightning' (*Br. Up*: II, iii, 6). Brahman showed itself like a lightning to the gods (but) once and disappeared. Or we may supply the word *tējas* (light) after *vidyutaḥ* and understand by the expression 'flashed like the light of a lightning'. *iti* points to the parallel instance and means 'as'. *it*=and. The following is another

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri
 parallel (to it). What is it ? *nyamtmishat* i.e. (twinkled) like the eye, (taking the verb) in a non-causative sense. *ā* (as before) indicates analogy (only) The meaning is 'also as the opening and the closing of the eye in respect of its object'. *iti*=thus. *adhidaivatam* i.e. a parallel (to the Supreme) in reference to its divine form.¹

5. Next in regard to the individualised Self—the mind appears to reach Brahman and by the same (mind, one) remembers (Brahman) constantly ; volition (also, likewise).

Atha=then. *adhyātmam* i.e. the illustration relating to the individual Self. *yad etat gachchati iva cha manas*=the mind approaches or perceives, as it were, this Brahman. *anēna cha* i.e. and by means of the same mind. *ētat*=Brahman. *upasmarati* i. e. the devotee remembers, as if Brah-

1. The two analogies here given are intended to suggest, as pointed out in the commentary on the next passage, that Brahman—the Lord of the Universe—is almighty and can illumine the whole Universe in an instant. There is also a further suggestion that the act of creating the world is quite easy for Brahman—as easy as the opening or the closing of the eye is to us, because there is no obstacle whatever in the way of the Creator.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai, Gangotri.
 man were near. *abhiṣṭham* = incessantly. *saṁ-*
kalpaḥ i.e. volition also points to Brahman. Be-
 cause the mind conditions Brahman, decision,
 memory, and the like mental states indicate
 Brahman (as clearly) as if it is being perceived.
 Thus it forms an illustration referring to the indi-
 vidualised Self. The sense is that, as limited by
 divine adjuncts, (Brahman may be conceived as)
 showing itself suddenly like the light of lightning,
 the twinkle of the eye; and that, as limited by the
 individual's body, Brahman may be conceived as
 showing itself simultaneously with mental states.
 Thus illustrated, Brahman is comprehensible by
 the dull-witted and hence the statement of
 parallels. Surely, as unconditioned, it cannot be
 understood by the dull-witted¹.

Moreover,

6. That, verily, is what is
 known as 'the dearest of all'
 It is to be meditated upon as
 such (*tadvaṇam*). Whoever knows
 it thus—him, all beings seek.

Tat=Brahman. *ha*=verily. *tadvaṇam* i. e. is
 what all creatures cling to, as being their inner

1. The present illustration is given in order to point
 out how the Self—as residing in the human body—
 manifests itself through mental states of all sorts.

Self. Hence it is known as *tadvanam*. Because it is thus well-known it has to be meditated upon (*upāsītavyam*) as such—by referring to this particular feature. (The next part of the passage) states the results of such meditation. *saḥ yaḥ*=whoever. *etat* i.e. Brahman of the said description. *evam*=i. e. as possessing the said characteristic. *vēda* i.e. meditates upon. *ēnam* i.e. such a devotee. *sarvāṇi*=all. *bhūtāni*=beings. *abhisamvāñchanti ha*=certainly seek, as indeed they do, Brahman itself.¹

7. 'Please, sir, teach me the secret.' 'The secret has been taught to thee ; we have taught thee the secret relating to the supreme Brahman.'

Thus taught, the disciple asked the teacher as follows—*upanishadam* i. e. the secret that has to be pondered. *bhō*=sir. *brāhi*=say. *iti*=thus. When the disciple said so, the teacher replied—*uktā*=has been taught. *tē*=to you. *upanishad*= (the secret). What is it then? The reply is—*Brāhmīm* i.e. relating to the supreme Self, for the instruction (given in sections i & ii) was in reference to the supreme Self. *vāva*=certainly. *upanishadam*

1. In accordance with the principle—*tadgunōpāsaneṇa tadēva phalam bhavati*.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri
abrāma iti—this merely reaffirms the substance of
 the answer (already given).

What is the intention of the pupil who (though) he has heard the secret (revealed) in respect of the supreme Self (still) asks—‘Please, sir, tell me the secret?’ If the question refers to what has already been imparted, it will be redundant and consequently, as useless as grinding what has already been well-ground. Or, if the secret, hitherto communicated, is incomplete, then it was not proper (for the teacher) to have concluded it by mentioning its final result (compare ii, 5.) (It has therefore to be understood that), as the matter has been closed once for all, the question cannot have reference to facts subsidiary to the teaching that has been imparted. What then can be the intention of the questioner? It is this—Is there anything else needed—whether as a subordinate or as a co-ordinate aid¹, to secure the fruit of the knowledge that has been communicated? Or, is it (what has been taught) whole in itself? If it needs (any aid), then teach me the needed secret; if not, affirm, as Pippalāda (did)², that there is nothing more (required). According to this view we can well explain the teacher’s affirma-

1. *śeṣhaśabdēna phalopakāryangamuktam; saha-kāriśabdēna anupasarjanamapi samuchchayārham vivakṣitam.*—*Tīkā*.

2. See *Prāṇōpanishad* vi, 7.

tion—that the secret has been revealed (to the disciple already).

Well, (what the teacher says here) cannot be termed an affirmation (at all) inasmuch as, in the next passage, he adds what remains to be added. True, the teacher (in the subsequent passage) says something that remains to be said, but what he says is not meant to be either a subordinate or a co-ordinate aid to the secret already communicated. It is only an external means for acquiring the knowledge of Brahman, as is patent from the fact that *tapas* &c. are associated, in that statement, with the *vēdas* and their *angas*. Neither the *vēdas* nor their *angas* like phonetics, for example, can be aids—subordinate or co-ordinate—in (securing the fruit of) Brahman-knowledge. If, however, it be urged that a proper apportionment of these should be made and that, as in the case of the *sūkta vāka mantras*⁵⁴ where a selection is made according to particular gods (invoked), *tapas* &c. should be taken as subordinate or co-ordinate aids (to Brahman-knowledge) and the *vēdas* and their *angas*

54. *Sūktavāka* is the name of a hymn, and in the *mantras* comprising it, are mentioned several deities such as *Agni*, *Agnishōmanu* and so on. These *mantras* are employed at the end of certain sacrifices but in employing them, variations are made in them according to the deity or deities invoked in the particular sacrifice.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri
 —because they enable one to understand only the meaning (of *védic* texts),— as means of acquiring information. Such an apportionment is quite necessary because then only do we light upon a consistent meaning (of the passage). (We reply)— It cannot be so; for it is against reason. The apportionment indicated does not hold good, for Brahma-knowledge, which deems (as illusory) all notions of agency, fruit &c, cannot need any support— whether of a subordinate or of a co-ordinate kind. This knowledge is in reference to what is our inner Self which is abstracted from all empirical entities. So also is its fruit—final release¹. Compare— 'Desiring liberation, one should give up all *karma* together with its aids. By such renunciation only can be known that which is the inmost essence of the person renouncing'. Hence knowledge cannot at all need *karma* as an aid and it is consequently wrong to resort to a separation of *satyam* &c. (from the *védas* &c.) as in the case of the *sūtravāka mantras*. The question and answer as re-affirming (what has already been stated) are quite appropriate (here)— Thus far has been stated the secret which does not depend upon anything else (for yielding its fruit of) immortality.

1. *Vidyāyāh vishayaparyālochanayā phalaparyālochanayā cha ndsti tatvataḥ sambandhavyōgyatā (karmāṇḍ)*
 —*Tikā*.

8. Its foundation is austerities, self-control, *karma*, the *Védas* and all their *angas*; truth (is its) abode.

Tasyai=tasyāḥ=of that secret relating to Brahman which we have taught you. *tapas* &c. are the means of acquiring knowledge¹. *tapas* is control over body, mind and senses. *damah*=calmness. *karma* i. e. *agnihótra* and the like. Brahma-knowledge comes to one who is qualified by these and whose mind is pure. It is well-known that in the case of those whose sins are not at an end, Brahman, though explained, is not understood at all or only wrongly understood, as in the case of *Indra* and *Viróchana*. Therefore (it is said that) knowledge springs only in one whose mind has been purified by *tapas* and the like, practised in this or in many past births. Compare—'Whoever has full faith in the Supreme and whose faith in his teacher is as (great) as in the Supreme, to him only become clear these things when they are explained' (*Svét: Up: vi 23*); 'Knowledge comes to those that are free from sin'. The word *iti* implies similar aids such as absence of pride, of

1. The *tikā* observes that the means mentioned are for the acquisition of the lower knowledge (as explained in the last two sections) as well as of the higher knowledge (as explained in the first two sections) or for knowing both the qualified and the unqualified Brahman.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri
 vanity and so forth for acquiring **Brahma-know-**
 ledge. *pratishthā*=feet i. e. as feet for this (know-
 ledge). When they exist, Brahma-knowledge
 stands established as a man does on his feet. The
 four *vēdas* and all the six *angas*, such as phonetics,
 are also its foundation for it is the *vēdas* that en-
 lighten us about *karma* as well as *jñāna*, while the
angas preserve (the *vēdas*). Or (we may say that)
 since the feet have been mentioned, the *vēdas* are
 all the remaining parts of the body (*sarvāṅgāni*) as
 the head and so forth. In this interpretation, the
angas should be understood as having been included
 under the term '*vēdas*' itself. When the main thing
 is mentioned the subordinate ones, depending on
 it, are always understood. *satyam*=truth. *āya-*
tanam i. e. abode, where the *upanishad* rests.
satyam is sincerity—absence of hypocrisy in
 thought, word and deed. Brahma-knowledge resides
 in people that are not hypocrites but are wholly
 virtuous and not at all in insincere people who
 are demon-like. Compare—'In whom there is no
 crookedness, no deception &c. (*Pra : Up : i, 16*).
 Hence *satyam* is stated to be the abode. Although
satyam has been included under *tapas* and the rest,
 as feet, it is again mentioned as the abode for indi-
 cating its superiority as a means. Compare—'A
 thousand horse-sacrifices and Truth were weighed
 in the balance and Truth, though single, outweighed
 the thousand sacrifices'.

9. Whoever knows this, he, indeed, vanquishing sin, abides in the infinite, the highest heaven. He doth abide (there).

Yo vai=(whoever indeed). *etām* i. e., this Brahma-knowledge, taught in what begins with *kēna ishitam*. *evam*=i. e., thus highly valuable—as glorified in sections iii and iv and forming the basis of all knowledge whatsoever. *veda*=(knows) though the result of Brahma-knowledge has already been mentioned it is repeated here for concluding the subject.¹ *apahatya*=having destroyed or shaken off. *pāpmānam* i. e., (sin or) the cause of mundane existence—ignorance, desire, and activity. *anantē*=endless. *svargē lokē* i. e., in Brahman which is of the nature of bliss. Since there is the qualifying word *anantē*, *svarga* does not refer to Heaven. Lest *anantē* be taken figuratively, it is added *jyēyē* i. e., great, superior to everything—i. e. the supreme Self. *pratishṭhatē*=resides. The purport is that such an one does not come back to this changing world.

1. So that the last passage refers to the true knowledge of Brahman which forms the subject-matter of sections i and ii and which leads to complete liberation. The lower knowledge dealt with in sections iii and iv and which leads to *kramamukti* has been concluded already.

End of the Fourth Section.

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri

Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri

